

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

|                               |   |                        |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| In Re Application of:         | ) |                        |
|                               | ) |                        |
| HENRY, Steven, G.             | ) | Examiner: Greene, S.L. |
|                               | ) |                        |
| Serial No. 09/998,795         | ) | Group Art Unit: 2173   |
|                               | ) |                        |
| Filing Date: December 3, 2001 | ) | Conf. No.: 7073        |
|                               | ) |                        |
| For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR | ) | Atty. Dkt.: 10016443-1 |
| DISPLAYING NETWORK DATA       | ) |                        |

PLEASE ENTER

LL

**APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF**

To: The Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer, paper number (unspecified), dated December 14, 2006.

**RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

In section 21 of the Examiner's Answer, the examiner responds to the arguments made by Appellant in the Appeal Brief by stating that the "Appellant only relies on the sworn statement as evidence" and that "Appellant have (sic) not provided factual evidence to show conception." The examiner then concludes that the "declaration is insufficient and not persuasive." These statements and conclusions are incorrect.

First, the sworn statements contained in the Rule 131 declaration are factual evidence and are sufficient to show conception. The Rule 131 declaration states that "on September 6, 2001,